



## 2. Issues to be Presented.

PPL must obtain Commission approval of its proposed Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan for 2011 through 2013 (“Plan”), as the Public Utility Code and Commission regulations mandate that the Commission must ensure universal service and energy conservation policies, activities and services for residential electric customers are appropriately funded and available in each electric distribution company territory. 66 Pa.C.S. § 2408(9), 52 Pa. Code § 54.71. The term “universal service and energy conservation” includes customer assistance programs (“CAPs”), termination of service protection and policies and services that help low-income customers to reduce or manage energy consumption. 66 Pa.C.S. § 2403, 52 Pa. Code § 54.72. A CAP is an alternative collection method that provides payment assistance to low-income, payment troubled utility customers. 52 Pa. Code § 54.72, 52 Pa. Code § 69.261.

On September 24, 2010, the Commission entered an Order (“Order, 9/24/10”) referring several issues to the Office of the Administrative Law Judge (“OALJ”) for hearing and directing the issuance of a Recommended Decision.

PCOC has identified the following issues concerning Universal Service, including but not limited to:

### A. OnTrack

- a. Payment plan levels: PPL’s proposed percentage of income levels should be lower to achieve real affordability for low-income customers.
- b. Arrearage co-payment: PPL’s arrearage co-payments should be eliminated as they are unaffordable for low-income customers.
- c. OnTrack payment calculation: PCOC supports the idea that PPL wants to burden other customers as little as possible. However, if the company determines the customer’s “ability to pay” amount is higher than the appropriate percentage of income level, the customer should not be penalized if they default; rather, the OnTrack amount should be adjusted.
- d. OnTrack credits: PCOC supports PPL’s increase in the OnTrack credit amount.
- e. Default: The CAP cure amount should be made clear to CAP customers when the company initiates termination proceedings.

- f. Enrollment and Re-enrollment: OnTrack “graduates” should be able to re-enroll in the program once they begin having payment trouble. Forcing “graduates” to stay out of the program for a year will only increase the amount of arrearages that accrue. Arrearage forgiveness after re-enrollment needs to be clarified in evidentiary hearings. PCOC supports automatic recertification for LIHEAP recipients.
- g. Automated OnTrack Processes: The automated processes, including auto re-enrollment, calculation of missed payment, dismissal for reaching the maximum allowable credits, are unclear and require evidentiary hearings to clarify.

## B. WRAP

- a. Coordination of Weatherization Activities: PPL’s Plan makes no explicit mention of the company’s intention to coordinate WRAP activities with other programs providing weatherization services to low income customers in PPL’s service territory or coordination with the low income programs initiated under Act 129 Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plans. Commission regulations explicitly require coordination. See 52 Pa. Code § 58.7(a). Since every major weatherization and conservation program in Pennsylvania has some form of coordination requirement, PPL’s Plan’s silence on the issue is a substantial legal flaw.
- b. Funding: PPL’s Plan seems to imply that funding for WRAP and Act 129 programs are related. The funding for these programs should be separate.
- c. Eligibility: Setting eligibility at 250% of FPIG is too high. Households under 150% should be prioritized. In addition to highest arrears and highest usage, lowest income households should be prioritized.

## C. Operation Help

- a. Enrollment level: PPL is planning on reducing the number of individuals that are helped through Operation Help. This reduction is inappropriate at a time when more households are in need of energy assistance.

- b. Funding levels: PPL should fund Operation Help higher than the current level.

3. Witnesses and Testimony.

PCOC identifies the following witness to testify regarding the above mentioned issues:

D. William Browning  
Pennsylvania Communities Organizing For Change  
Legislative Director  
846 N. Broad St. 2nd Fl.  
Philadelphia, PA 19130  
215-839-3393

4. Proposed Schedule

PCOC has petitioned to intervene in this proceeding today and therefore, has not been in discussions with the parties regarding a proposed schedule.

5. Public Input Hearings.

PCOC requests that Public Input Hearings be scheduled in Harrisburg.

6. Settlement.

PCOC is willing to participate in settlement negotiations concerning all issues raised by this case.

7. Service on PCOC

PCOC will be represented in this case by Harry S. Geller, Esquire and Julie George, Esquire. One hard copy of all documents should be served on PCOC as follows:

Harry S. Geller, Esquire  
Julie George, Esquire  
Pennsylvania Utility Law Project  
118 Locust Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17102  
Telephone: 717-236-9486  
Facsimile: 717-233-4088  
E-mail: [pulp@palegalaid.net](mailto:pulp@palegalaid.net)

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Harry S. Geller, Esq.  
Julie George, Esq.

*Attorneys for PCOC*  
Pennsylvania Utility Law Project  
118 Locust Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17102  
Telephone: 717-236-9486  
Facsimile: 717-233-4088  
E-mail: [pulp@palegalaid.net](mailto:pulp@palegalaid.net)

October 24, 2010